

Zero

**"Urban guerrilla warfare
is based
the
that
conditions
will
be ripe
for**



The coffins of Baader and Raspe

**armed struggle, it will be too
late to
prepare
for it."**
-R.A.F.

The murder on October 18 of the three Red Army Faction prisoners, Andreas Baader, Gudrun Ensslin and Jan-Carl Raspe at Stammheim was the culmination of the West German state's recently developed double strategy of ending each of its 120 or so political prisoners as hostages against further guerrilla activity, and of destroying the politics of the guerrilla opposition psychologically through use of the media. Those were not the timorous aims of the Federal Republic's new tactic. Holger Meinhof was murdered at Müllich prison on November 9, 1974, to break the third RAF hunger strike. Siegfried Hauser was murdered at Stammheim on May 4, 1975 in answer to the attack against the West Germany embassy in Stockholm, in which he was wounded and captured, and because he could prove that the explosion at the embassy was the work of a West German special police squad. Ulrike Meinhof was murdered at Stammheim on May 9, 1976 shortly before a petition was to be presented to the court proving the complicity of the FRG in the Vietnamese war.

Each has been a carefully planned action, with the murder intended to spread its poison as the result of deteriorating medical conditions. The preparation has not been restricted to the hanging but to the poisoning that has been intended to psychological preparation of the public for weeks in advance through the media, to instil among other things the conviction that suicide on the part of RAF prisoners is a self-destructive and RAF policies. West Germany is an officer of law: the West German state was able to carry out its strategy.

On April 7 this year, during the fourth hunger strike, Federal Attorney General Bauback, who had been responsible for the deaths of Ulrike Meinhof, Siegfried Hauser and Holger Meinhof, was executed in Karlsruhe. The Ulrike Meinhof Commando claimed responsibility. The hunger strike prisoners were immediately transferred to total isolation conditions, that is, held as hostages. They automatically went into third strike. Earlier the prisoners' lawyers had finally forced the authorities to conduct a medical enquiry into the conditions under which West Germany's political prisoners were being held. The investigation recommended that political prisoners should in future be held either in ordinary prison conditions, or all at one special location, or in groupings of 15 at different locations. The central demand of the fourth hunger, and now third, strike, was that these recommendations be implemented. After four days the

total isolation became too much for the authorities to openly justify and was lifted. The prisoners ended their third strike, but the hunger strike continued. On April 30 the Regional Justice Ministry of the Baden-Württemberg area (which includes Stammheim) announced that a high level decision had been taken to concentrate all political prisoners into groups of 15. Given this assurance the 80 prisoners ended their hunger strike.

The concession of allowing prisoners to concentrate into groups of 15 directly obstructed the authorities' "anti-terrorist" tactic of holding all political prisoners as hostages. All the more to become by now it had been decided to solve the problem Stammheim as it had become called, since and for all. Accordingly as soon as pressure on the government had eased (the possibility of hunger strikers dying on the one hand, and public concern at legitimacy of the hunger strikers' demands on the

other) the new Federal Attorney General Rebmann, who had himself conducted negotiations with the hunger strikers, set about sabotaging the implementation of the demands.

It now became obvious that the one final obstacle to the extermination strategy were the prisoners' lawyers who clearly understood their role to be saving the lives of their clients and ensuring their human rights. In the weeks that followed the authorities, fronted by Rebmann, launched a campaign with the complicity of the

media to systematically defame and criminalise all lawyers and people working with political prisoners. The state called it "drying out the sympathisers swamp". After the hunger strike Andreas Baader, Gudrun Ensslin, Jan-Carl Raspe, Ingrid Schubert and Ingrid Muller were the only prisoners on Stammheim's seventh floor. Then three more RAF prisoners, Werner Hoppe, Wolfgang Beer and Helmut Pohl, were shipped in from Hamburg. After being wounded and captured in a shout-out Gunther Sonnenberg and Verena Becker arrived. Gunther Sonnenberg, who had been shot in the head, was almost immediately transferred to a psychiatric clinic near Frankfurt. Finally a tenth prisoner arrived, Sabine Schmitz. Stammheim was the only prison where the authorities' assurance was even partly implemented. Verena Becker and Sabine Schmitz were held isolated from the other prisoners and only managed to obtain contact with them (an hour or two a day) after a long and severe hunger strike. During this time their two Stuttgart lawyers, Arnd Muller and Armin Newerla were charged with attempted murder, since they hadn't intervened to stop the hunger strike, a clear expression of the new tactics used to criminalise defence aid. After further waiting for the government to implement its assurance, 16 people, including the Holger Meins Commando which had attacked the Stockholm embassy and other prisoners not in Stammheim, resumed the hunger strike. It now became clear that the state was preparing to use this new situation to murder RAF prisoners. Rebmann launched a counter-information campaign including production of a document detailing "outstanding prison conditions" of the political prisoners and thus publicly undermining the hunger strike. Next the campaign against defence lawyers and "sympathisers" was reinforced. In practice this meant regular raids on houses and offices, and finally a discussion of the politics of force-feeding, was started in the press with the aim of preparing the West German population for the use of the so called British method ie. as long as the prisoner is fit mentally she or he either eats or dies. In an interview with *Welt am Sonntag* Rebmann let slip: "It's always bad if prisoners die, but the population wants the state to behave towards the prisoners as their terrible acts demand."

On July 30 Jürgen Ponto, head of Dresdener Bank and board member of Krupp, Daimler-Benz, AEG-Telefunken and Thyssen, was shot dead when he resisted kidnapping.

continued next page



Gudrun Ensslin. Photo taken shortly before her death in Stammheim a few months before her murder.



Andreas Baader and Gudrun Ensslin (during trial)

two things clear. It showed that the RAF still had the ability and continuity to attack central positions in the switchboard of imperialist power, and at the same time it showed that the guerrilla structure was still out of reach for the state. It also provided the pretext for the authorities to escalate their strategy into its final phase. Six days later Andreas Baader was 'accidentally' locked in Gudrun Ensslin's cell after the 'free association' period. An hour later the 'mistake' was discovered and they were taken out and beaten. Three days later (August 5) 40 to 50 police and soldiers brutally beat up the three RAF prisoners and threw themselves any cell which was at hand. They were then beaten up a second time when sorted out into their own cells. On August 23 Gudrun Ensslin and two other women prisoners were rushed to hospital. The two prisoners who had been on hunger strike and who had interrupted it due to the extremely brutal force-feeding methods now went on hunger and thirst strike and over 40 other prisoners joined in. Werner Hoppe, Wolfgang Bieri and Helmut Pohl were transferred back to Hamburg, Ingrid Müller to a prison near Munich, and Sabine Schmitz and Verena Becker put back into isolation.

Once again the West German government came under heavy international pressure to concede the prisoners' demands. Organisations from all over Europe protested, including

lawyers' and judges' associations, the Russell Peace Foundation and Amnesty International. Never having had any intention of fulfilling its assurances to the prisoners, the West German authorities merely escalated their campaign against the 'sympathisers' and the prisoners, including the Antifas (anti-fascist groups working with the prisoners and trying to publicise the role of the FDR in Europe) were systematically defamed in the press and constantly harassed. Raids took place and documents were confiscated from flats all over the country, including some at the border in transit to the European Court of Human Rights where a case was being prepared against the West German Government. The culmination of this campaign was the bombing of the office of defense lawyers Grosse, Newerla and Müller in Stuttgart on the night of August 14/15. Files and papers were destroyed. As might be expected the authorities had had the office under constant surveillance from a house opposite yet claimed to have seen no one enter or leave. This was in fact because, like the Stockholm explosion, they had done it themselves.

Rebmann had by now made it clear that despite international pressure he intended to use the hungerstrike to murder the prisoners. He was quoted in a newspaper interview as saying 'I don't care if they die'. Accordingly on September 3 the prisoners came out of

thirst and hungerstrike not wishing to make the Attorney-General's job easier. Two days later Hans Schleyer, ex SS troop leader, head of Federal Union of German Employer Associations and president of the Federation Of German Industry was taken prisoner by the RAF. Immediately 70 prisoners were put into total isolation as hostages, a move justified by the government on grounds that West Germany was in a state of emergency. A Berlin judge criticised the isolation of prisoners under his charge as unnecessary. The government quickly 'legalised' the situation by rushing through the *Kontaktperrre* (contact ban) law in just three days. The events that took place from then until the West German state, at a point where all political prisoners were in isolation and every one associated with their defence either under arrest or frightened off, chose to murder three of its hostages, are well known. Unconfirmed reports suggest that Andreas Baader and probably Gudrun Ensslin, Irmgard Müller and Jan-Carl Raspe were flown via Crete to Somalia and put in contact with the guerrillas holding the hostages at Mogadishu, in order to convince them that the West German authorities were meeting their demands. Using this cover of immanent exchange the SAS-led German Special Commando unit was able to shoot their way into the aircraft

and free the hostages. Every state murders those that resist their power. The model West German state does it three at a time. ☐ Black Aid Group

● For at least one of the two SAS men at Mogadishu, working with the German GS 9 commando was not his first taste of excitement. Sgt. Barry Davies has already played a very active role in Northern Ireland 'counter-insurgency'. In 1973 he and another British SAS officer, Captain Dent, were captured by the IRA in the Grosvenor/Falls area. An ensuing dispute between the Officials and Provisionals as to who should deal with them was only solved by them having one each. Dent was 'executed' by the Provs, and Davies was shot and left for dead by the 'stickies'. Unfortunately he survived to receive a substantial cash payment for the incident from the Northern Ireland Office and an MBE for 'services to community relations in Northern Ireland' in the 74 honours list. Presumably the same 'community relations' he displayed at Mogadishu.

Barcelona '77

Last year when I was in Andalucía, a young socialist student from Madrid told me Anarchism was of historical interest but had not survived the fierce repression and was now a spent force. It was then possible to believe him in spite of the odd C.N.T. graffiti, or the history of anarchism that you could pick out from the rows of books devoted to Marxist analysis.

In Barcelona this year such a gloomy statement would be ludicrous.

Wandering at random around central Barcelona I found the headquarters of the anarchist unions for tourist and transportation industries and the regional office, it wasn't a matter of looking at nameplates, each had an enormous black and red flag hanging outside. The nameplates looked as if they have been there for decades, Franco might as well not have bothered.

The June elections have already had their psychological effect. The newspapers and magazines are focusing almost exclusively on parliamentary activities and ignoring Neighbourhood Associations, and needless to say, C.N.T. and other anarchist activity. In an analysis of coverage in the national press, the C.N.T. paper found that the worst papers for ignoring the C.N.T. were in fact the supposedly liberal papers like *El País*. They attribute this to the number of socialist and communist members on the staff. The division between parliamentary opposition and the rest is already clearly defined. The closer the socialists and communists get to exercising state power, the less they will be able to appear as agents for real change. The Spanish Communist leader Carrillo has been calling for a government of 'national concentration' i.e. because of the crises, he is happy to share power with the present right wing government.

This is, of course, the policy being put into effect by the Italian communists. In *Alto Blam-o* (White Garlic), an article called 'Eurorepression' uses the Italian and German examples to warn of the new forms of repression which will replace the crude excesses of fascism. It points out how the Italian Communist Party is trying to portray everybody who rejects their Labour Party style 'social contract' as either a criminal or a lunatic. When students were shot by police in Bologna, it was not a political act, simply a way of dealing with bandits. There is strong identification of the C.N.T. with the revolt in Spanish prisons in July. The revolt was of 'ordinary' or 'social' prisoners which, of course, for anarchists are just as 'political' and in need of amnesty as those more usually accepted as political prisoners. Only a



Jan-Carl Raspe

Ireland's first

On the weekend of Oct. 1/2 the first Irish National Women's Conference was held in Belfast despite enormous obstacles. Typical of these was difficulty in finding a venue; the Queen's University of Belfast Students' Union refused use of its facilities on account of the sexist bias of the conference (for full details of the correspondence on this see Oct. issue of *More Nite*). The same attitude was reflected in the subsequent press coverage of the event in the *Northern Ireland Sunday News*, that '100 word article was entitled "Men-Keep Out", and at one might expect from such a heading, the account was principally concerned with the exclusion of male participants rather than with the concrete achievements of the women involved. Since all the papers had been officially informed by the conference and invited to send along women reporters and photographers, the planning committee was justifiably indignant at the media response. However, it is an apt illustration of the prevailing climate here.

Such activities are a disturbing well over a hundred women came to the conference which finally took place in the Exeter Hall Dept. of Queen's University. They came from all parts of the country, both north and south, as well as from Britain. There were women of all ages present, mostly

from the 20 to 30 age group, with a large section was made up of students and university graduates which brought home to us the urgency, and difficulty, of forming links with women from other social groups and especially those in rural areas.

We divided into small groups for workshop sessions, the same topics being discussed simultaneously in each group. Themes included violence against women, health and the relationship between feminism and republicanism. It was difficult in the time available to establish an atmosphere in which it was possible to get into a subject in any depth, and discussion often remained superficial. I felt that in my group we let ourselves be tyrannised by the suggested structure, instead of scrapping it when it didn't suit us and working out our own procedures. Many women voiced the opinion that the real value of the weekend lay in the personal contacts made outside the workshops. I think a lot of us went home having made several new friends. For me, one of the high points was an exhilarating discussion on Feminism and Anarchism which took place on Sunday morning. This was not on the original schedule but formed spontaneously when two or three of us discovered a similarity of interests and approach, six women in

all attended. We are hoping to maintain regular contact with each other and to make some kind of contribution, as Anarch-Feminists, to the next conference due to take place in Dublin some time in January.

There was a plenary session on Sunday afternoon, which brought to the surface a number of problems the Irish women's movement will have to confront. Firstly, there seems to be a divide between those women who see the 'movement' as an organisation resembling traditional political parties and groups, and those who want it to become something completely different, and secondly, there is clearly disagreement concerning what attitude - if any - we should take towards the 'national question'. These issues have still to be resolved - something that will take time. On the positive side, it was decided to set up a telephone tree so that feminists throughout the country could be mobilised at a moment's notice to support campaigns and demonstrations and to start a feminist newsletter so that people will be informed of all the activities of all the different women's groups. All were unanimous in recognising the need for another conference in the near future and women from Dublin volunteered to undertake the task of arranging one. ☐ Romira Worvill

few months ago, Carrillo dismissed the C.N.T. as a bunch of faggots and 'drug users'. The article points out that for 'scientific socialists' like Hobsbawm, anarchism is fundamentally a pre-industrial messianic movement, an anachronistic nuisance in the industrial age. In Italy the Communist Party has been trying to dismiss the student opposition as 'criminal terrorists', and there is nothing to indicate that the Spanish variety would be any different.

But, the main conflict is between the people and the fascist state machinery, which is still intact and dangerous. People are very aware of the pretence of democracy which the government is presenting to the world as the 'real thing'. I was continually being warned that nothing had really changed. Well, the huge festivals in Barcelona of communists and anarchists, the big Trotskyist banners hung across the main streets, the C.N.T. stalls in the Ramblas, show that there is a different atmosphere.

The tension between the liberal cosmetics and the ogre beneath is never far away. The political state security court may have been abolished, but the forces of 'public order' have never been particularly interested in courts. The armed police seem like some sort of Praetorian Guard without an emperor. Nearly every night the Ramblas becomes a battlefield between the armed police *Los Grises* (after their grey uniforms) and young militants. I saw the police attack two demonstrations with truncheons followed by rubber bullets. In neither case was there the slightest provocations from the demonstrators. After the demonstration in Barcelona on Sept. 11, one man was killed by a rubber bullet and a large number injured.

At a Spanish meeting in London a couple of months ago the only person

to defend one of the basic tenets of feminism, the need for women to meet and organise separately from men, was an Italian. In the last few months a book shop and a women's bar have opened in Barcelona; a demonstration following the rape and murder of a young woman there was 15,000 strong. Many of the revolutionary organisations have not yet experienced the full impact of women's growing awareness of the oppression that has rocked similar organisations in other European countries. In *Ajo Blanco* a woman writes bitterly about the way women were prevented from having their own meeting during the July libertarian festival; not just by the male organisers but by *Mujeres Libres* (Free Women), the anarchist women's organisation.

The strongest impression I've come back with is the sense that in Spain the possibilities are much greater than in other European countries. While in some respects, like communal living, 'dope the main hope', etc., a lot of the stuff people are saying sounds like somewhere else ten years ago, I got the strong impression that when people say that nothing has really changed, the real change they are talking about is a lot more profound than simply trying for the combination of limited personal freedom and economic oppression, the 'European pill', which Suarez and the bourgeoisie are trying to peddle. I hadn't realised how acclimated to that atmosphere of intensity and optimism I'd become until I hit Heathrow. 'Welcome to Britain and the Queen's Silver Jubilee'. The only visible graffiti, 'Chelsea', the only poster 'Jesus Saves'. The first song, 'NO FUTURE' □ Farrel

On Thursday October 6 we made placards saying 'Since When Has Rape Been A Joke?' and 'One Woman Raped Is Every Woman Raped' as well as 'Men Against Rape' for some male supporters to carry. We also wrote a short leaflet to give to shoppers.

On Friday October 6 a group of us, including four men, assembled outside Catford Tesco and started giving out leaflets and talking to people in the shop. We were overwhelmed by the response, women were particularly angry and eager to sign our petition. Many people said they would write to Tesco's head office personally. One

Drawing: Larkin



Your friendly neighbourhood store

elderly woman became very distressed on seeing the underpants displayed on our placard and said that she had been raped. It had been years ago, but her distress was still very acute. 'It's no use going to the police', she said, 'they don't care'. What came over very strongly was anger and indignation and the comment 'of course it's not funny'.

After about an hour or so the manager came out and said that he had taken them off the shelves and what happened then was 'up to head office'.

We had contacted the *South East London Mercury* who had sent a reporter and a photographer. Their story, a very sensational account entitled 'Get 'Em Off' appeared on the front page the next Thursday. As a result of a press release by us a small piece appeared in the *Sunday Times*. The worst account appeared in the *Sun* a week later, calling us 'chanting women shoppers' and slanting the story to suit their style of reporting.

It was interesting to see the comments of *Sunarama Ltd.*, the manufacturers. Their sales manager, David Claret, told the *South East London Mercury*, 'I have never heard anything so ridiculous in all my life. You've only got to look at the guy's face to see that it's funny'. However, by the time the *Sun* was interested he had changed his tune and was regretting the mistake and saying that they were 'not continuing with that line after October'.

Tesco's too, were mumbling sanctimoniously about being 'a family store' and that the underpants had slipped into the shops unnoticed—despite Mr Baker's comments of a few days earlier, they made a great show about saying that they had withdrawn all the stock □ Georgina Lee

Dial a dyke

Lesbian Line is a new 'phone service for women operated entirely by women and offering help, advice and information. The service is run collectively, both administration and 'phone duties are rotated and shared equally, decisions are taken at regular meetings.

This is the first time a woman has been able to ring up and be sure of speaking to another woman, whether she just wants information regarding women only events, and places, or the opportunity to talk at length to a woman who will have experiences similar to her own □

At present *Lesbian Line* are open for any woman who wants to ring between 2-10pm. on Monday and Friday. Letters may be sent c/o BM 1514, London WC1V 6XX. Small social gatherings will also be held to enable women to talk and to get to know other lesbians. *Lesbian Line's* telephone number is: 01 794 2942.

Half Moon rising

The Half-Moon Theatre is a small company which performs in a converted synagogue in Aldgate, and which has built up a reputation for left-wing agitational theatre, often very much tied to the East End and its history.

For the past five years, they have been fighting to save Wilton's Music Hall in Stepney, probably the oldest of its kind in Britain, for the East End community. Their rivals have been the Music Hall Trust, which wants to restore the building exclusively as a Music Hall, but in May 1977 it seemed that the GLC (then Labour-controlled) would lease the building to the Half-Moon, after the theatre had raised loans and promises totalling £400,000.

The East End has experienced some drastic changes over the past few years—industry has been moving out and the docks have been run-down to a close. This has left vast areas of land available for development and the property firms are now swooping down on the East End.

When the Tories regained control of the GLC in the May 1977 elections, they announced a 'review' of the position regarding Wilton's, and immediately Taylor-Woodrow, a huge property company, put in a bid, saying that they would rebuild it elsewhere if it couldn't be renovated on its present site. Their aim is to move it to their development scheme at St. Katherine's Dock, which isn't



Anthony Trent (left) and Howard Lewis in Andy Smith's *Grand Larceny*



Tescos 'checked'

The South East London Anarchist-Feminist Group consists of twelve women covering geographically an area from Brixton to Bickley. We heard via the Rape Crisis Centre that Tesco were selling nationally, in their Home and Wear section, men's underpants with the caption 'Your Friendly Neighbourhood Rapist' and decided that direct action was called for.

In our search for the underpants locally we tried Bromley first. A male anarchist friend came with me and asked if they had this particular line. The manager treated this as a straight business deal and he asked a young woman assistant to get 'the rude ones'. My friend said he felt like Jack the

Ripper. It transpired that they had sold out, but they had other gems like 'I've Laid a Million'.

We next went to Eltham where the manager sniggered and said that they had been so popular that they had sold out. At Catford we were rewarded and went away with a pair of underpants costing 69p. Depicting a dirty old man with no trousers on and creeping along underneath the caption 'Your Friendly Neighbourhood Rapist'.

We phoned Stephen Baker, Catford's Home and Wear manager, saying that we found the underpants offensive and asking if Tesco would withdraw them. He replied 'It's a very good line, we sell lots and have no intention of withdrawing them'.



Wilton's Music Hall Stepney: closed and crumbling

very far away geographically, but what TW are building there is a million miles away from the everyday lives of the East End people.

TW's plans for St. Katherine's include expensive private housing, a yacht club and marina, luxury hotels and, of course, office blocks. With characteristic generosity and consideration for the needs of the local people, TW agreed to build 300 council houses (the area has a housing waiting list of 6,000, with twice that number living in sub-standard accommodation) paid for by the GLC. In return, the company was given a 25-year lease on the 26-acre site at the absurdly low cost of £165,000 per year. TW are now all set to make over £200 million profit on the scheme—a record in this country.

More recently, Marius Goring of the Music Hall Trust, a former president of the actors' union, Equity (where he was well-known as an opponent of the left wing) has worked closely with TW's St. Katherine's Dock Development chairman Peter Drew. Both want to restore Wilton's as a musical hall and highly profitable tourist trap.

The Tories have said that they don't

think that the Half-Moon taking over the lease would be 'financially viable'; they deny that their refusal has anything to do with the political nature of the theatre's productions.

However, in view of local opposition to property developers and the support for the campaign to save Wilton's for the East End community to which it belongs, it seems unlikely that the Tories will risk making too many enemies by allowing the building to be demolished to make way for office development. It seems more likely that they'll set up a joint trust (including the Half-Moon) which will be given the lease, enabling the theatre to have some influence over its use. This is especially so if—as is now rumoured—TW are pulling out of the fight for Wilton's, having failed in their ludicrous attempt to present a benevolent, philanthropic image and instead received a lot of not very good publicity.

Meanwhile, the Half-Moon are staging a musical, *Grand Larceny* by Andy Smith, based on these events and the destruction of the East End by speculators and developers. It goes on tour throughout the East End from Nov 20 '77. ☐ Geoff Ingarfield

attacked and to act as a forum for the exchange of experience gained in the use of all forms of occupation. Information on the campaign and the conference may be obtained from: CACTL, c/o 35 Wellington Street, London WC2. 01-289 3877.

☐ Ray Martin

On October 31 the GLC housing policy committee agreed a scheme to offer tenancies in 'hard to let' flats to squatters in their properties. While the scheme is being arranged squatters will be offered licences to stay in their present homes. The licence fee is likely to be £1 to £2 per week per room and will not include an obligation on the part of the GLC to do repairs.

Generally families will be rehoused together, single, ie. unmarried, people will be rehoused in groups of up to four.

The result of this 'magnanimous' offer from the Tory GLC will be an end to squatting by the simple expedient of changing the name 'squatter' into 'tenant' or 'licence holder'; large supportive communities at present based in squats will be destroyed along with the political significance of those groups; people will be given the 'privilege' of paying a fee to remain in their homes without any of the protection of being a tenant under the Rent Acts—all this with the backing of the Criminal Trespass Laws.

Trespass criminalised

Next month sees the arrival of the Criminal Trespass Laws as part 2 of the Criminal Law Act 1977. This law creates five new offences involving trespass; what's more, it gives the police the power to enter, search and arrest, without a warrant, on the grounds that they suspect that one of these offences has been committed. They carry maximum penalties of six months in jail and/or a £1,000 fine. Furthermore they will be tried only in magistrates' courts, making conviction a virtual certainty.

Briefly, the offences are as follows:

1. Using or threatening violence to secure entry to premises
2. Adverse occupation of residential property.
3. Trespassing with an offensive weapon
4. Trespassing on embassy premises.
5. Resisting or obstructing a bailiff or sheriff.

It's very clear that these measures provide the state, property speculators and industrial barons with plenty of scope. Like the immigration laws, the Prevention of Terrorism Act and the extensive use of conspiracy and public order laws, they have been passed with the active collusion of all parties in Parliament; true to form, the various factions of the ruling classes have united in the face of growing direct action over the last five years.

The state, with the cooperation of the media, have sought to present these new offences as being directed solely against the squatting movement; undoubtedly they will be the first target, there have already been at least two attempts to use the law as if it is

already in force.

However, the Criminal Trespass Laws are potentially a very effective weapon against all forms of occupation—industrial occupations have been successfully used to fight back in disputes over wages, redundancies, closures, equal pay and other issues. Add to this number the workers involved in hospital work-ins, the occupations of empty homes, women's centres and refuges, colleges, rent offices, town halls, social security offices, nurseries, community centres, embassies and recently a sewage shaft in North London, and it becomes easy to understand this use of squatting as a smokescreen. The number of 'criminals' created by this law 'at a stroke' is staggering.

Although this law has arrived with little hindrance, opposition to its repressive intentions is widespread, and includes trade unions at national and local level, student unions, as well as tenants', squatters' and other community organisations. Naturally the state is quite immune to paper resolutions, effective opposition will be achieved only by continued use of occupations in the future. This will be possible only if occupations are supported and defended by all sections of the broad working class movement.

In order to consolidate opposition, the Campaign Against a Criminal Trespass Law is holding a national conference on November 26/27 at Digbeth Civic Hall, Birmingham. The conference aims to discuss further opposition to the law, the defence of occupations which are threatened or



Illustration: Cliff Harper

Fare fight in Milan



Ever since Milan's Communist-Socialist government proposed a fare rise for the city's bus and underground services a constant direct action campaign has been waged against the public transport authorities, not only resisting the proposed increases but demanding free public transport. Buses have been hijacked, trains burned and underground stations regularly occupied to prevent the payment and collecting of fares.

The campaign, which has attracted support from *autonomia* groups, *Circoli Giovanili* (Youth Circles), the *Indians* and also the highly opportunistic Leninist groups *Loita Continua* and *MLS*, has been organised by the recently formed *Lega Libertaria* (Libertarian League).

A tube occupation on a Saturday in October went like this: several *Lega Libertaria* members met in the morning to decide which of Milan's underground stations was to be 'liberated' that day. Various jobs were assigned and 'propaganda materials' (leaflets, posters, spraycans, etc.) distributed. Once the place and exact time of the demonstration were decided twenty to thirty people set off immediately to the



ATM (initials of Milan's transport authority) Free! — the direct action rush hour.

selected stations. On arrival one comrade walked through the ticket barrier, to be stopped by the ticket controller. Several others appeared to give support to the first, and this exchange took place.

'This is a demonstration against the proposed fare increases. It is not a violent demonstration so please stay calm.' 'All right, but I must go and report it.' 'Look! we said a peaceful demonstration, not a pacifist one, so just make yourself comfortable and stay put.' By this time other comrades had succeeded in blocking all the ticket machines with bits of metal, plastic and generous helpings of glue. Others were giving out leaflets and others inviting

people through the barriers for free. Lookouts were checking for the arrival of the *Carabinieri* and people were prevented from reaching the telephones.

The occupation was only temporary so messages of longer duration were left on the walls in the form of graffiti and posters. After about half an hour everyone dispersed to avoid the police.

While the *Lega Libertaria* recognise many other areas of struggle that need to be fought and won, Milan's anarchists and libertarians are determined to make these liberatory actions a daily feature of the city's life until everyone rides for free. Enne

Tokyo towers

The Japanese government's claim to have removed the last obstacle to the construction of the New Tokyo International Airport at Narita (Sanrizuka) are propaganda bullshit. What they did was achieve a surprise early-morning victory by pulling down the farmers' iron towers that had been erected to prevent planes from landing and taking off. No one denies them that victory, despite the action's being based on a dubious point of law. What can be refuted is the gov't claim—splashed all over the too-willing mass-media—that the airport can now be opened within the year. By removing the biggest obstacle first, instead of leaving it till last as was confidently expected, the gov't aimed a psychological knock-out punch at the movement's chin. No question that many are stunned; but equally no doubt that the movement is far from dead.

The farmers of Sanrizuka resisted gov't attempts to throw them off their land, a few years ago erected two iron towers which effectively blocked the flightpath, and prevented the start of orientation flights for pilots. In order to forestall a gov't attempt to pull down the towers, the farmers had built living quarters inside them, thus converting them into houses and therefore more difficult to remove.

Without obtaining formal sanction, however, the government acted. Soon after dawn on May 6, while already engaged with farmers' representatives concerning the legality of the law hitherto quoted to justify the removal of the towers, it sent in a secret force of bulldozers guarded by riot police, and within a few hours the towers were down. By enlisting the collusion of the courts, it was able to cite an entirely different clause in the law to justify its action.

The reaction within the movement was one of shock. The towers had been a symbol of the anti-state struggle, and no-one could believe the radio's announcement of their fall.

So: the towers are down, and the government has unleashed a veritable barrage of propaganda upon the public to kill sympathy for the farmers. The mass media have, without exception, accepted its interpretation. However, the way is not yet clear by any means for the construction of the airport. The reasons are as follows:

1. No practical transportation link between the airport and the centre of Tokyo has been built. The area is at present served by two railway lines catering for suburban commuters, but these could never hope to absorb the extra traffic which the airport would create. The existing high-speed motorway is also choked with cars, and while a new one is on the drawing boards, construction has not yet begun. Opposition from local residents will not make it any easier. The new "bullet-train" link is also but a planner's dream because of lack of funds. Meanwhile, Narita is further from the centre of Tokyo than any airport in the world is from its respective city. For example, flight time from Manila to Japan would be doubled by the time required to get to Tokyo.

2. The airport has only one runway. Land requisitioned for the second is still in the possession of local farmers, who refuse to sell. Moreover, the existing runway is too short, as farmers still own 750 metres at one end.

3. The "airport" authorities have not yet found a way to supply fuel to the planes which would land there. Plans to transport jet fuel by pipeline from nearby refineries have been nipped in the bud by local residents' opposition. Provisional plans to transport it by rail have also been thwarted by local railway workers who, in solidarity with the farmers, have refused to take out the tanker trains. The Government, by means of bribes and blackmail, has slowly been bringing local assemblies around to accepting its position, but this is only serving to demonstrate to local people which side their "representatives" are really on.

4. The cost of the airport has risen to an astronomical 1 billion yen (£2,000 million). If the government cannot afford to build a road, it will be hard to find that kind of money. Moreover, the screw has been turned by exposure of last year's budget hearings, in which a secret govt report, revealing that it would be cheaper to extend the present Tokyo Airport at Haneda, was brought to light.

In other words, what the government has achieved by pulling down the towers, and what it claims to have achieved, are two quite different things.

The history of the Sanrizuka struggle can be followed in *Ampo* magazine (PO Box 5250, Tokyo Int'l, Tokyo, Japan) and issue 3 of *Libero International* (Both are stocked at Rising Free), or better still through the newsletter of the Sanrizuka International Support Group (c/o Kobe Gakusei Seinen Centre, 3-1-1 Yamada-cho, Nada-ku, Kobe, Japan 659) □ Wai Tyler. *Libero International* Editorial Collective.

Back to the night



Reclaiming the night

On Saturday November 12, hundreds of women invaded the night streets of Brighton, Bristol, Guildford, Lancaster, Leeds, London, Manchester, Nottingham, Oldham, Salisbury, Sheffield, Sunderland, Tyne-Wear and York. The actions differed from city to city, but all the said women are angry: we exist and we are going to be seen and heard.

We demand the right to be on any street at any time, to walk alone or in groups without men "protecting" us from other men. We took action because the fear and reality of rape are always with us and will always be used to keep us in our place—down.

Some women are afraid to walk across their own estates to see friends. A woman in Bradford was beaten and raped on her way to work. She died from those injuries two days later. In Leeds six women were raped. They were dismissed incidents but were only seriously realised by the press when a "period" woman was attacked. Four

women were prostitutes, and violence against prostitutes goes unnoticed. It is a largely invisible part of the Game: power over women. The local police inspector publicly warned women to keep off the streets (at all times of the day).

Soho, London: We, as London women, chose Soho because it is a symbol of all sexploitation. Five hundred women started off from Leicester Square. Some held torches, some held hands, some wore masks and stripey make-up. One elegant Dracula in grey cloak bared her fangs at passers-by. We whooped and yelled. We sang and chanted: 'Yes means yes—no means no, however we dress and wherever we go... Just because a woman's a wife it doesn't mean yes for the rest of her life. There were cymbals, party squeakers, whistles and tin cans clacking.

Men hassled and jeered—from shouts of 'sunt, sunt', to 'they're all dykes', from 'who'd want to rape them?' to 'they want to be raped really.' Some

men backed down when they found themselves surrounded by large groups of women. Sex shops were stink-bombed, decorated with stickers (some men were too!) and splashed with red paints. Some strip joints turned their lights down and shut up. One policeman guarded male customers who were cowering inside a shop.

Door to door canvassing before the night showed that residents were angry, and sympathetic to our action. Some women passers-by shouted support to us. One woman who lived in the area told me her disgust at hearing men shout 'we want rape'.

It was a great high for me to be part of such firework energy. It was chilling, too, to see how easily men identified with rapists. Until women end the distortion of what sex is and what women are (and only women and consciousness can do this, not the law) women will be safe and free nowhere. □ Margot Farnham

WEST GERMANY: A MODEL OF REPRESSION



In the last few weeks most people have been aware of the important political events occurring in West Germany. The existence of so called terrorist groups killing and kidnapping leading members of industry and politics (Apart from Schleyer, the Attorney General Buback, and the banker Pöhl have been assassinated this year alone) is a phenomenon that few people here have understood. If little is known about urban guerilla groups like the Red Army Faction (founded in 1970), even less is known about the repressive reaction of the State. In order to get a bit nearer to understanding the developments in the Federal Republic over the last few years, certain questions have to be asked and answered.

Is the expansion of the repressive apparatus solely meant to deal with the threat to the State posed by urban guerilla groups? The Federal Republic is not a police state in the sense that Nazi Germany was, nevertheless millions of people have been efformally integrated into the police apparatus, as deputy sheriffs, searching for the 'wanted' terrorists. How can this be explained? What kind of state is the Federal Republic of Germany? How has the left responded to the situation?

The three most important guerilla groups—the Red Army Faction (RAF), the Second of June Movement (responsible for the kidnapping of leading Christian Democrat Peter Lorenz in West Berlin in 1975), and the Revolutionary Cells (RZ), describe the Federal Republic as an example of 'new fascism'. 'New fascism' is a kind of institutionalized fascism, where total control is exercised by the social and political institutions of the state, and not necessarily by its police forces. I would prefer to describe West Germany as an authoritarian bourgeois democracy, which is using more and more heavily fascist measures to destroy all forms of both legal and illegal political opposition. Further the guerilla groups believe West Germany to be the loyal servant of US imperialism—the US policeman in Europe. Although the growth of West German neo-imperialism—the interventions in Portugal, Italy and Spain show this clearly—is undeniable, the description of the Federal Republic as a dependent loyal servant of US imperialism both simplifies and underestimates the nature of West German capitalism and its particular brand of neo-imperialism.

In any case, the urban guerilla groups have declared

war on this state, and despite the massive attempts by the state to destroy them they have survived for seven years. The state has not even succeeded in substantially reducing their capacity to attack it.

What the state has succeeded in doing is to criminalize all legal forms of political opposition, and in presenting and selling 'terrorists' as a species of sub-humans. Everybody who tries to regard 'terrorism' as political, and who sees the explanation for 'terrorism' in the repressive nature of the state itself, are called 'sympathizers', and are criminalized by means of guilt through association. In the last few weeks the so-called sympathizers have even been seen by the state as the people who 'have to be eliminated if the terrorist groups are to be neutralized'.

This kind of propaganda is accepted unquestioningly by the entire population. In the best manner of Guebark press and television as organs for the official version of events, have succeeded in putting over 'communism' as the real threat to the West German working class. They have successfully diverted attention from unemployment (West Germany has had a million unemployed for more

than two years), and other areas of social and political conflict such as the struggle against nuclear power. The practice of the urban guerrilla groups has made their task easier. The logic of the conflict between guerrilla and state has demanded an increasing brutality on both sides. For instance the kidnapping of Schleyer was logically not possible without the killing of three policemen and an officer (probably a communist). This has enabled the media to attack the RAF's claim that their actions are only aimed at the mighty—prisoners are regarded more or less as normal workers in West Germany by most people. The depiction of the Lufthansa Boeing left festive ammunition in this propaganda offensive. The message is clear: everybody should feel threatened. When people believe this kind of nonsense, then it's only logical that they should actively defend their own interests by joining in the hunt for the 'terrorists'. The RAF describes this kind of propaganda as part of the psychological warfare waged by the state against the guerrilla. What they fail to see is the inherent contradiction in their own practice: in their attempt to fight effectively against the repressive apparatus, they have adopted some of the forms and brutality of the apparatus itself. It's hard to find Bourdieu's principle: 'We carry a new world in our heads.' In the politics and practice of the RAF.

Nevertheless, the identification of a large part of the West German working and middle classes with the state and its repressive policies can't simply be explained in terms of the anti-urban guerrilla propaganda offensive of the last seven years. Most anti-communism has been an integral part of official West German ideology since the creation of the Federal Republic in 1949. The Germans have been taught to fear everything radical and economic rather than the behaviour of their own government as the perpetrator of all forms of left-wing oppression. After the war the German Communist Party (KPD) was ruthlessly attacked and criminalized, leading to its legalization in 1956. As a working class party they didn't fit in with the new bourgeoisie ideology between working class and capital. Workers should view themselves as workers, and should regard themselves as workers (Arbeitnehmer), and capitalists were no longer capitalists but workers (Arbeitgeber). The interests of the working class were then placed in the 'safe and reliable' hands of trade union bureaucrats. The working class was offered an exchange in return for the highest standard of living in the world: they were to give up all militancy and critical opposition. They accepted.

What this means is that very few people have a direct experience of practical conflict, either on the shop floor or in their communities or elsewhere. Only the left, and more recently young people and members of Citizens Initiatives against nuclear power, have been involved in direct physical confrontation with the police. The RAF police conflict is seen by most people as a somewhat distant spectacle brought not to them through the mediation of press and television. The experience of 40,000 demonstrators against a fast breeder reactor at Kalkar in September, where they were met by tanks, helicopters and sub-machine guns every few yards, is shared by very few. The most common view is that the state is there to protect us and our democracy, and when we have to live some of our interests in this process, well it has to be done.

The authoritarian structure of German society has hardly changed over the last hundred years. People in Germany (both East and West) tend to believe and accept what they're told. This has an abstract, formal understanding of democracy. The constitution is democratic, but not its code books. Therefore democracy must exist. Democracy is something we elect them to, but not in contrast to the freedom to fight for democracy and against fascism in the 1940s. One should remember that the RAF was born in Germany, as reflected in the results of military service. West Germany was a model state from its inception—both according to a blueprint and not by the western allies after the war. Working class resistance and left-wing opposition had no place in this blueprint. The trade unions, for example, are a 'model' which all other capitalist countries would dearly love to possess. They have always played their role faithfully and successfully. They're simply there to keep the working class under control, and to guarantee that the exchange value of their agreement with capital (high standard of living, high sickness benefit and so on) doesn't become less.

Finally, with the possible exception of the Ruhr, all working class communities not destroyed by the war, have since been torn apart by local, federal and state governments. The content of everyday life has become poorer and poorer. Germans go to work, go home and watch television. German pubs are either relatively empty, or when people are there they don't talk to each other. When working class communities don't exist as we know them here, they can't undertake struggles in their own interests, nor can they support other struggles. For example, the role that working class communities played in the Miners' Strikes here is just not possible in the Federal Republic.

These are the factors that have to be taken into account when trying to understand the kind of militant McCarthyism rampant in West Germany today. Despite the support that different West German governments have had in creating and maintaining 'social peace', they



Gedron, Andreas, Jan-Carl, tortured and murdered in Stillebüttel

are worried that the crises of capitalism, with unemployment and so on, might upset their model. This is the key to the explanation of the massive expansion of the repressive apparatus and practice. Repression has a preventive function. Repressive measures aren't simply introduced as response to attacks made on the state by the urban guerrilla, their wider purpose is to discipline the entire society, to tell anybody who doesn't already know that resistance is useless.

Whenever workers, young people, leftists attempt to take their own interests into their own hands they are met with the full opposition of the repressive apparatus. The main problem for the state in this context is to legitimate its actions, and it does this by attempting to integrate the content of these autonomous movements, as far as possible. For example, 'anti-authoritarian' kindergartens and youth centres were at first met with suspicion and opposition, but at the same time the state realized that these projects expressed the real desires of large numbers of people, so they've tried to integrate them, by setting up their own projects. The problem for the state is that this strategy doesn't always work because

throughout West Germany whenever a 'terrorist' attack takes place (everybody has to turn on their radios to get instructions from the police), are aimed at familiarising everyone with police state methods and at making clear that the state is in full control, and everybody should accept the existence of heavily armed police on every street corner as being 'normal'.

This kind of preventive repression has functioned well. West Germany has had more than a million unemployed for over two years, and yet there has been no major struggle against redundancies. The Federal Republic of Germany is a huge social prison where, as long as you obey the rules nothing or little will happen to you. For those people who step out of line the special treatment described above is reserved. And they can expect little solidarity from their fellow prisoners, who don't see themselves as such, and feel threatened when others try to make this prison reality clear to them.

THE LEFT AND ITS RESPONSE

The left has been torn apart by the events of the last year. In West Germany there are two main tendencies, sectarian Maoists (with the exception of the Kommunistische Bund-KB) and the anti-authoritarian movement. Trotskyists play almost no role. The sectarian Maoists are all true to the Peking line and spend most of their time shouting in the desert, without recognising it. It's difficult to take them seriously. Large parts of the non-sectarian left have become so involved in the hysteria of dissociation from the RAF, that they are hardly able to resist attacks made on them by the state. It often seems that many groups consider the RAF to be their main enemy. The question is, what kind of resistance is possible in the Federal Republic at the moment? The left has been criminalized and isolated to such an extent that many people are either thinking in terms of going underground or into exile. The fact that a principle part of the RAF's political evaluation—namely that the legality of the left will be destroyed—has proved to be correct, makes the politically more attractive. The guerrilla will be a fact of West German political life for a long time to come. But for those groups who reject the politics of the guerrilla the situation is disastrous. Nobody outside these groups listens to the left at the moment, and it is difficult to see how this should change. I think that the only option open to the left at the moment is a broad non-sectarian alliance against state repression, where all remnants of surviving opposition can come together. Whether this will happen is another question. The Russell Tribunal on the violation of human rights in the Federal Republic which will take place next March, is a very important factor in this context. The state's vulnerable point is criticism from abroad. Whatever the left can do in other countries at the moment to



List of wanted 'anarchists' at Düsseldorf air terminal. 700,000DM for 14 people. Crosses indicate the arrest of Verena Becker and Siegfried Haag, and blank squares 'terrorists' killed

the most important element, i.e. self-liberation, is missing. The measures taken by the state over the last few years are partially an attack on the guerrilla, but a closer look at laws like the Contact Ban Law (Kontaktsperregesetz), a suspension of habeus corpus, and the executive decisions taken by the Conference of Interior Ministers show that the real target is the intimidation of all forms of opposition. The Kontaktsperregesetz isolates prisoners by refusing them access to lawyers, newspapers and television, but it also means that anybody can be picked up by the police, shut away in some unknown prison for an indefinite period of time under the pretext of supporting terrorism. Similarly, the decision of the Interior Ministers (an executive and not a parliamentary decision, as most measures are) to round suspects

publicize and explain the developments in the Federal Republic is the best possible form of international solidarity; it should be remembered that the German model is the model which capitalism would like to impose throughout Europe. Events in Portugal have shown what West German neo-imperialism is capable of achieving. Social peace in a model Europe is clearly what the West Germans and their allies hope to impose. The fight against model Germany, then, is at the same time the fight against the creation of a model Europe along West German lines.

We in West Germany need all possible solidarity if we are to survive. Hans Schmidt

REVIEWS

AGAINST OUR WILL, MEN WOMEN AND RAPE. By Susan Brownmiller. (Penguin Books 95p.)



Against Our Will is a shocking and frightening book. The material which Susan Brownmiller has so thoroughly researched comes across as a truly terrifying reality. The inflammatory nature of the subject, rape, demands careful distinctions between verifiable incidents and exaggerated accounts, rumours, hysterical irrational fears, propaganda. This book succeeds in making these distinctions, rationally, sympathetically, and honestly.

The meaning of the word rape must be assessed in a twofold manner — as a single act which recurs as part of objective reality with a frequency and variety that is appalling and, further, as a concept which has had a role in the coercive and competitive authority structure in which women are subjugated to men, used as sexual objects, as valuable commodities in the marriage market, as pawns and dangerous symbols of power in slave systems, as propaganda items in war machines.

Susan Brownmiller establishes a connection between the two meanings by a historical review of male property rights in women, and of the development of legal definitions of rape from early days when it was regarded as a crime against a man's interest, either that of the father with an economic stake in his daughter's virginity or that of the husband with exclusive rights of possession of his wife's chastity. The Middle Ages saw the beginnings of state concern in the safety of individuals and some attempt to define rape as an injury against the woman herself. But this attempt has remained a largely unrealised ideal as clear from the well-documented records of rape as it occurred in this century in all its ugly forms — from war rape to spontaneous domestic attack — from lone assaults to urban gang rape. The author is at great pains to distinguish different types of assault directed at different types of victim, e.g. women of all ages, classes, creeds, children, prisoners of either sex, and at the same time to indicate what is common to all these types: excessive or manipulative domination of weaker persons by stronger individuals or groups by the physical and mental degradation of the victim.

The difficulties involved in seeking protection against rape derive from inadequate legal definitions, from a prejudice against women as a built-in formality in the legal system which embodies the idea of woman as a

lying vengeful creature who will cry rape for no good reason, and the reluctance on the part of the women themselves to be made public property as they inevitably are in the court procedures which attend a prosecution.

The prevalence of rape and difficulties of redress leads Susan Brownmiller to the convincing conclusion that rape is 'a conscious process of intimidation by which all men keep all women in a state of fear'. This is a highly radical suggestion and will be offensive, no doubt, to many men who cannot envisage themselves in the role of rapist. However while there is effectively a curfew on women, while we are denied security and equality in our own homes, while we are subjected to potential humiliation in a variety of more or less subtle forms, rape is a process in which we are all involved. Men and women are locked in a relationship of dominance/submission. This relationship must be broken if rape is to be 'denied its future'.

In the face of this radical critique the author's conclusion may seem weak and reformist in some, and no doubt repugnant to others. They amount to an insistence that the law be extended to cover more types of rape and that rape be defined with reference to other types of criminal assault, that prejudice against women in the courts be fully exposed and obliterated, that women should learn to defend themselves against rape and feel confident in their own strength. At the present time such a view demands that rapists be sent to prison. This will inevitably constitute a dilemma to anarchists since it means relying on the legal system to put right what is essentially a political problem, and to engage the interest of the state or the police is not likely to be regarded as a revolutionary or moral activity.

Whatever the objections that anarchists may raise against the conclusions in this book let us hope that they will debate constructively and not subject women, once again, to the time old arguments. Otherwise, most women, if there has to be a choice between anarchism and feminism, are likely to say 'sad anarchism'. □ Jean Jones

SOCIALISM AND THE NEW LIFE. By Sheila Rowbotham and Jeffrey Weeks. (Pluto Press £1.80)



In *Socialism and the New Life*, The personal and sexual politics of Edward Carpenter and Havelock Ellis and its companion volume *A New World For Women*, Sheila Rowbotham and Jeffrey Weeks explore the theory and practice of the radicals of 19th century sexual

politics through the individual lives of three people and their associates.

The material gathered together here could be a starting-point for further research and radical analysis of the pervasive control of our sexuality by society and an invitation to refute the liberal, biological models of social and sexual behaviour. At first I found this personalisation of ideas confusing, since I am used to accepting the theoretical concepts involved as being a part of our language and thought-structure and have imagined there to be no way of discovering how we come to have such concepts or how to criticise their presence in our midst, since the weight of our liberal culture spins such an effective web over the recent past.

The diversion/deflection of radical ideas through obscenity charges and other forms of repression lead to the adoption of a moderate stance by some of the pioneers of sexual reform, which in turn developed its own links with the later, fascist, theories of 'racial progress'. (This is not to say that all the early campaigners were so deflected; Stella Browne and Edward Carpenter certainly were not).

After a spiritual/emotional crisis in youth, Ellis spent his life advocating sex-reform, believing that human nature is essentially good and that therefore sexual freedom would bring a new age of happiness in its wake. He was the first person to use the term homosexual (although not homosexual himself he married a lesbian, Edith Lees) and his first work 'Sexual Inversion' was published in 1897. It was effectively banned (all future editions of his studies were printed in America) and to this day no full British edition of Ellis' most important work has appeared. Ellis' aim was to show that homosexuality is not a product of particular national vices or periods of social decay but a common and recurrent part of human sexuality. He chose to do this by collating all the available data on animals, primitive peoples and ancient civilisations, and famous literary and artistic figures. He sought to detach homosexuality from its 19th century connotations of degeneracy, disease and insanity, and present it as a harmless quirk of nature, with overtones of moral excellence and respectability.

He was fundamentally a conservative in that he held homosexuality to be a minority anomaly, whilst he went to some length to stress that male homosexuals were not effeminate, he was unable to say that lesbianism was not a deeply rooted element of masculinity in women because of his inner acceptance of the heterosexual ideology of 'nurture' as the basic sexual structure of our society, with all that implies of male aggression and female passivity.

Ellis' second work 'Auto-eroticism', a term he coined, gave cautious approval to masturbation, and in 1927 another volume examined other non-reproductive forms of sex and sex-related behaviour, including sadism and masochism, coprophilia, necrophilia, kleptomania, and others. This work predicted that of observing the urination of women etc. He felt that these things were natural and only harmful if another person were hurt.

He believed that every healthy woman should at least once in her life exercise her 'supreme function' in the interest of the race, which clashed with his firm support of contraception and abortion to be controlled by women.

Nonetheless, Ellis 'succeeded' in that he raised the question of sexuality from the depths of Victorian consciousness to the level of rational discussion. But he fundamentally rejected the idea that

sex-roles are socially moulded, unlike Freud, because he felt that such a view would not fit into any 'rational biological scheme'.

He had great personal charisma, and radicals such as Emma Goldman and Margaret Sanger saw him as a 'giant'.

In contrast to Ellis, Edward Carpenter's politics were lived out on the personal level, in that he deserted the ranks of the upper middle-class to live a simple life at Millthorpe, a cottage near Sheffield, where he attempted to live as one of the working people.

Edward Carpenter was in revolt from the class materialism of the Victorian age; he was homosexual and ardently supported feminist aspirations. His ideas tended towards socialism with a drift towards the anarchism exemplified by Kropotkin's mutual aid, but rejecting that of direct conflict. Ms Rowbotham traces in delightful detail Carpenter's many links with socialists in Sheffield, Bristol, London and Cambridge, and gives us glimpses of the socialist fellowship and cultural life of that period, when it was considered axiomatic that to be a socialist implied internal change and conscious struggle with personal relationships. Nonetheless in spite of his support for the rebellion of women in his book 'Love's Coming of Age' Carpenter accepted 'masculinity' and 'femininity' as fixed characteristics and followed Engels in assuming that the sexual division of labour was a natural result of the biological difference between men and women. He developed a stereotype of androgyny, 'the intermediate sex' — i.e. homosexuality as transcending sex divisions, which unfortunately sidesteps the problem of male elitism in the world, he also portrayed feminists as not quite 'normal': some are 'without strong sexual or maternal instincts', some 'mannish', some 'homogenic' some 'ultra-rationalising and brain-cultured'. Carpenter's greatest achievement was his struggle to live out his political commitment as a transformation of everyday life. The socialist's vision of Utopia included happiness, love, and the new life, not just a redistribution of wealth.

Stella Browne (1882-1955) was remarkable, in that she never wavered from her belief in women's fundamental right to control their own bodies and her commitment to socialist revolution. Although she was influenced by Carpenter and Ellis in her paper 'The Sexual Variety and Variability among Women and their Bearing upon Social Reconstruction' she also felt strongly that men had altogether too much to say about sexual response in women, and that men, by seeking sexual release with prostitutes before marriage, had brutalised concepts of sexuality, both their own and women's. She fought for birth control and abortion on demand, and left the Communist Party because they would not support the latter. She believed that women had a right to sexual pleasure, denied that the maternal instinct existed, presumably along with other 'innate characteristics', and publicly testified, in 1936, that she had had an abortion — a remarkably courageous action.

Stella Browne was unusual in that she did not move toward the right in an attempt to win support for her aims. Dora Russell writes in 'The Tamarisk Tree' 'Stella Browne was a holy terror. She made no bones about raising the abortion issue at meetings and, wisps of hair floating down from her untidy coiffure, would resist all efforts of a chairman to put her down'. □ Zadie Farr

Half the sky

Yu Shuet, a former Cantonese Red Guard, fled to Hong Kong in 1973, thoroughly disillusioned with the 'Great, Glorious, Socialist Red China'. Despite Maoist accusations that she had become a rightwinger she reimmersed herself in social-revolutionary struggle on arrival. In 1974 her essay *The Dust of Rationality* was published, criticising Maoism and exposing the real conditions inside China. She then edited, with Wu Man, *The Revelations That Moved The World To Tears* a collection of poetry, letters and short stories written by young people inside China. Yu Shuet is currently writing a book analysing the roots of China's presentday totalitarian character. Zero talked with her about the role of women in the country where according to Mao's phrase, women hold up half the sky.

Zero: Can you give us a general outline of the position of women in Chinese society and compare it with the situation of women in Hong Kong?

Yu Shuet: It's much better if you ask specific questions, because I don't know much about Hong Kong.

What is the family structure like in today's Red China? Are there any differences from the traditional type, have there been any moves to change it since 1949?

Yu: There are no changes at all. Very much the same as in the traditional way! The father is still the head of the family and everyone else is under his authority.

How about live-in and living together, is this allowed in China?

Yu: Of course it is not so open as it is in Hong Kong, especially since it is not allowed within the ideology. For example, if you and I talk about this question you don't feel surprised or freaked out—but, in China, if you talk freely to anyone that you are living with someone then people will probably show surprise and even approve you.

Does the party take any action against those that live together?

Yu: Yes, it's illegal—You can be sent to labour re-education!

What is their attitude?

Yu: They encourage.

Will men and women live in petty bourgeois?

Yu: Of course, but this is not the reason for your question, it's only one through attitude.

Is there any age limit for marriage?

Yu: They are advocating late marriage at the moment.

Is there a legal minimum age for marriage?

Yu: Yes, 28 for men and 26 for women.

How about divorce?

Yu: Yes, you can get a divorce, but you have to get permission, i.e. divorce certificate.

In the divorce is only needed by one side, what happens?

Yu: There has to be agreement on both sides before a divorce certificate. I think it's the same everywhere in the world.

Are abortion and contraception available in China?

Yu: Yes, China advocates birth control, it is available. It doesn't matter whether you are married or not, you can get an abortion and contraception. However, this is only a recent development, and the reason is population control, not women's emancipation. China's population is too large.

If an unmarried woman becomes pregnant, is it possible for her to get an abortion?

Yu: I think their laws for abortion is very simple, they don't consider whether you're married or not. But the people in your unit know about it, you can be sent to labour re-education for having illicit intercourse.

Well, it's quite easy for the people in the unit to know about it, so in other words, it's very easy for you to get sentenced.

Yu: Yes.

Is there any incidence of rape in China?

Yu: Yes, a lot. Many prisoners are jailed because of this.

What is the court's attitude to the woman in such cases?

Yu: I don't know about that.

Are there any cases of battered wives in China, as this is very common in Hong Kong?

Yu: Yes, it's the same in China. I would say that male chauvinism is even greater in China than Hong Kong. In Hong Kong, women are more independent and if such things occur, they can leave the family, or get a divorce, but it's very difficult to get a divorce in China,

or to leave the family, so even if women are beaten-up, there is still nothing they can do.

How about the government. We always hear through the media that they are trying to raise the position of women in China.

Yu: Oh, this is only for their own political reasons. What they want is to have some women to participate in some roles in the administration. For example, in the factories they want some women to become part of the administrative staff, or in the Standing Committee of the Peoples Conference there may be some women to vice-chair some committees. In other words, they just want to put some women in some positions in the government or party. This to me, is not women's liberation at all. It is only a type of official politics; they just want as many people to participate in their party politics as possible. It is to serve their politics, and it is not going to get you freedom. In production, they are trying to get more women to work. For example, in factories they set up nurseries, the reason being to get more women to work, because in a lot of traditional villages, there's still a large number of women not taking part in production as they have children to look after, and this reduces the production force. It is for this reason they set up the nurseries, not for women's liberation. So, their 'women's liberation' is designed to get more productive labour and to provide more tools to make people participate in their politics. It is very much the same as in Hong Kong and the West. The capitalists say that women should have their right to work in factories, but when they do so, their motive is to achieve a better way to use the whole human race, who just exploit male labour on the market, the women should be exploited too! They are not looking at it from a revolutionary humanitarian point of view at all. The Chinese government only advocated 'women's liberation' from a capitalist profit-making viewpoint, not real emancipation. For example, there is the very laughable thing where they say that a man can go out into the field to wash the cows, so women should be able to do that too; a man can lift 150 catty (250 lbs) so women should be able to do that too. This is very clearly ridiculous, they just want to exploit women's labour, because we know women are obviously physically different from men.

Also it's clear that their view is that men are all right—what is needed now is to raise the capability of women in production.

Yu: Yes, it's not like maths where one is equal to one. Even among men there are different capabilities, some men can lift 150 catty, others can't. They are not talking about everyone doing what they can, just about exploiting everyone equally.

Is it easy for women to get promoted at work?

Yu: No, it's not easy at all. That's why the government have had to start their campaign. Just look at the situation in their Central Committee and see how many women are in it, then we can understand how bad the situation is.

Can you give us a general outline about the nursery system? Do women have to go to the nursery to look after their children during their tea-breaks?

Yu: The nursery is available to all babies and children up to seven. It only opens during the daytime and the children have to be taken home after they close. It depends how old the children are; if they need to be breast-fed, then the mothers have to go to the nursery to feed them; if they don't need feeding then the mothers aren't allowed to see their children. They still breast-feed children in China, only one tin of powdered milk is issued when a child is born. Anyway, in most of the farming villages they don't have any nursery.

Is there any difference in education between the sexes?

Yu: No, there are none, but I think that it's going that way and that sooner or later there will be a difference.

Is it easy for women to get into higher education?

Yu: It is still low in percentage terms, but I don't know the reason.

Is there any difference between men and women's wages?

Yu: There is a difference in the farming villages, but not in the factories—the class of skilled labour you are determines your wage. In the farming villages it is quite common for women to get two work points less than men.

In the factories, what class of skilled labour do the women usually belong to?

Yu: I don't know much about the factories. I believe there is a difference between men and women. It is usually that men are skilled workers and women are not, and therefore get lower wages. I believe it is the culture which always makes women less important than men, so they tend not to become technically skilled.

Is there any sex education in Chinese schools?

Yu: No, there is no sex education in schools. And even in health education when the teacher mentions sex, they laugh.

Is there any difference in expectations regarding the sexes?

Yu: No, except in old peoples' minds. However, as the children grow up, they realise that they have less and less control over their lives—they give up.

Do people talk about masturbation?

Yu: No, they don't. They may not even know about the term at all. I think if you talk about it, they'd probably see you as *floods and monsters*! Of course, in reality it exists; some friend told me that in the labour camp he saw people punished for it.

And what is their attitude towards homosexuals?

Yu: Floods and monsters!

Have women in China heard about the women's movement in the West?

Yu: No. The only one who talked about it is Chiang Chin,* and what she said is what I have just told you.

During the cultural revolution, did you ever think about the problems that women face?

Yu: No. We were only students then and we didn't suffer much repression, so we hadn't thought about it at all.

What is your view of women's liberation now?

Yu: I think it is very important and our emancipation is a very basic thing, because the family is the basic unit of our society—without its liberation we cannot have the liberation of society. □ Yuen Wong



NOTES

1. Labour camps used to 're-educate' offenders.
2. While not actually illegal it is officially unacceptable to marry below this age.
3. Trials are not closed in China but they are unannounced. Consequently most Chinese know almost nothing about the functioning of the courts.
4. Work voucher system by which village and agricultural workers are paid.
5. *Floods and monsters* is a Chinese expression for something that is so dangerous nothing can stop it.
6. Chiang Chin, member of Central Committee until early this year when she was arrested as one of the gang of four.

LETTERS

ZERO 4 Zero is an anarchist/anarcha-feminist monthly produced by a mixed collective, mainly from East London. Zero is looking for streetsellers (pick up Zeros from Rising Free — cash returned for any copies unsold) and distributors in Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Contact us through Rising Free.
Production: Zero Collective. 01-555 6287, c/o Rising Free, 182 Upper Street, Islington, London N1.
Typesetting: Bread 'n Roses 01-485 4432.
Process Camera: Chris Broad 01-359 4794.

UK Distribution: Publications Distribution Co-op 01-251 4976. USA Distribution: Carrier Pigeon, 88 Fisher Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02120. ISSN 0140 3826

Anticopyright providing this credit: Zero, Anarchist/Anarcha-feminist newsmagazine, is given, except for commercial use for which standard copyright applies.

Correction: In Zero 3 we mistakenly stated that *Black August* was a libertarian theatre group. In fact not all its members are libertarians, also the motorway play mentioned as *Black August's* next production is in fact being worked on by another group. Sorry for the confusion.

Letters marked* have been cut for reasons of space.



Dear friends*
I have only just discovered your great magazine, in Rough Trade record shop. It's very good that it got in there because shops that specialise in New-Wave rock are, naturally enough, frequented by New-Wave fans, a fair number of whom are very discontented with the current order of things. Young people must be reached because few of them have clear political ideas, so if they can be convinced of anarchism's beauty and, perhaps even more important, its practicability, this will be a crucial gain. My main reason for writing, apart from my excitement at discovering Zero is to offer the services of the group to which I belong, the Outsiders in playing benefits for Zero.

Adrian
Long Ditton, Surrey



Dear Zero.
Here is *New Rave*, I think we are in the same business.

Jamie (for *New Rave*)
Birmingham 18.



Dear Zero*
I liked Zero—a few people I know thought it was a bit thin on feminist content but I'm sure that will develop. Our anarchist group is relatively small but fairly active—we have fortnightly meetings, and discuss things like the family and relating the personal to the political etc. we are also doing some stuff on the property developers in the council for the local elections. I am also fairly involved in the women's movement here—at present we are fighting some repressive abortion legislation that the government is attempting to introduce and we've been doing a lot of street theatre, and other more nasty things. A number of us in the anarchist group and also some

other women are interested in forming an anarcho-feminist collective to develop some ideas and maybe write something. It's a lovely spring day here—and I'm sitting in the attic watching the trees roll in the wind.

With love and solidarity,
Margaret
Christchurch, New Zealand



Salut,*

I wasn't there, but I was very much involved in the *apres Malville* discussions.

The first point is that anarchists were not free from blame in turning Malville into a confused fiasco. As your article pointed out, the original aim was to take over the site using non-violent tactics. This aim was changed to a 'legal' march merely as a show of force. Obviously many people, and in particular the anarchists from the Anarchist Federation and other groups, were very angry at this decision. But instead of working with the organisers, instead of working with the people who had changed, some tried to impose their view demagogically, and at the last minute. This happened at the Montaliu general meeting, and when John Lintolt and Roy Carr-Hill talk about imposed decisions from the 'might of the organised French left', we should remember that this included the Anarchist Federation. As a writer in the Lyon libertarian paper *IRL* concludes, anarchists are not free from the paranoia and megalomania which typify political sects. The result of the manipulation by extreme left groups and anarchists was the chaos, confusion and lack of organisation which everybody agrees was present at Malville.

The second point is the question of violence/non-violence. The ecologists and 'non-violents' (La Gueule Ouverte, union pacifists, comites Malville) were determined to be non-violent but did not sufficiently consider the need for efficient organisation. There was a lack of walkie-talkies (called talkie-walkies in France!), megaphones, original ideas on autodéfense etc. The anarchists—not all anarchists of course, but most of the 'violent' group were anarchists—went armed with helmets, sticks, molotov cocktails. In other words, both groups were polarised from the start. It seems to me that a confrontation with the CRS would be violent because the CRS would not hesitate to attack. On the other hand, to go armed ready to attack is I think equally unrealistic—especially if you consider how nervous the CRS are in these situations. Well

organised—in the best sense of the word organised—with everyone willing to participate actively in the organisation, imaginative and creative, a strategy of autodéfense and determination could have worked in defeating the CRS. It's a pity the

idea of blinding the CRS (weather permitting) with a few thousand mirrors didn't materialise. Another idea was the use of kites to prevent the CRS helicopters seeing what was going on. A seventy-year-old I met after Malville told me that his idea of using laughing gas had been rejected. Shame. It is these sort of ideas rather than abstract discussions of violence/non-violence that could have turned Malville into a celebration of people's ideas, and of their refusal to accept an imposed death bomb.

Paddy Hill
Lyon, France



Dear Zero,

Since the ending of political status in March last year the number of prisoners fighting to retain political status in Northern Irish prisons has steadily grown. These prisoners of war are refusing to accept criminal status, not because they believe themselves better, or above, the so-called common criminal. This struggle is necessary to continually remind the world that the people of Northern Ireland are at war against British imperialism.

The struggle for status began in September 1976 with the conviction of the first Republican prisoner since the removal of political status; Kieran Nugent refused to wear prison clothes or do any prison work. Today 200 prisoners in Long Kesh cell block, Crumlin Road and Armagh jail are spending 24 hours a day in their cells, naked except for a blanket, deprived of reading material, visits and letters. Beaten at any excuse, they are forced to collect food from the canteen naked, humiliated and ridiculed at every opportunity. With their food often contaminated to render it impossible to eat, the prisoners are already suffering from sores and rashes due to their inadequate diet. A speaker for the Relatives Action Committee said that the prisoners had been subjected to vicious cruelty in an attempt to break their morale. The prisoners in 'H' Block at Long Kesh are all suffering from failing eyesight because they are denied any exercise in fresh air. They have to live in an environment where they are subjected to the glare of artificial strip lighting permanently. The prisoners in 'B' Wing, Crumlin Road jail are completely naked, even denied a blanket to cover them. The women prisoners in Armagh jail are isolated in 'A1' Wing. When they are permitted to leave the cells in the morning to go to the toilet, they are accompanied by wardens with guard-dogs. These dogs are encouraged to attack the women at the slightest excuse.

The prisoners are steadily losing their remission. Every fortnight they are disciplined. Days in solitary confinement are impossible, because of the overcrowded conditions, so the beds and blankets are removed from the cells for three days and nights. These men and women are struggling against one of the most oppressive manifestations of the state

machinery. They need your support. Demand political status. Write to Roy Mason, Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, Stormont, Northern Ireland, and Callaghan, 10 Downing Street, London.

Solidarity
Louise Crane
Leicester



Dear Fellow Workers,

We are a group of anarchists who've decided to get together regularly to get involved in workers' struggles in London, exchange experiences, and come up with some answers to problems we face with Unions, management, industrial action, isolations, sexism etc. We aim to be an open and active group, so all anarchists and other independent militants, whether industrial or home workers, or self employed, are encouraged to come along. We meet fortnightly at Rising Free (see Agitprop).

Dave
London Workers Group
Box W, Rising Free,
182 Upper Street
London N1



Dear Zero*

I was very impressed with Zero 3, especially the letters page! I was on (or rather near to) writing a letter like the one from North London AWA myself. Glad they did it for me. As for myself, *rape is a* 'means by which all men hold all women in a state of powerlessness'. Not that I feel any great desire to go out and rape (though I do recognise—and am working on—my murky subconscious). Rather, that I can walk home at night whistling 'Sukiyaki' while Hiroko, with whom I live, cannot. That is why all men are responsible for rape, and until men begin organising as men to create awareness of their participation in a system that creates fear—instead of leaving it all to women—the situation will continue. Love and struggle
Wat
Japan



Dear Zero Collective*

Please don't send me any more issues of Zero! The issues I still have left on my subscription please send to Plymouth feminist group. I have reached this decision because, I personally, don't get any benefit from the predominantly feminist line of Zero. The class struggle is the most important issue from my own position as a member of the working-class.

Good bye and good luck,
Graham Short
Pennyross, Plymouth

Socialist Challenge

☐ UK Subscription £3 (consecutive issues + postage to total of £3)
☐ International Surface Mail Subscription £4 (U.S. \$9) (consecutive issues + surface postage to total of £3)
☐ International Airmail Subscription £4 (U.S. \$9) (consecutive issues + airmail postage to total of £3)
* Make payable to ZERO COLLECTIVE (international subscribers can't I.M.O. only)
Name (block caps) _____
Address _____
Send to:
ZERO RISING FREE,
182 UPPER STREET,
LONDON N1.

REVIEWS

GRUNWICKS. By Joe Rogaly. (Penguin 80p)

When two sides in a conflict have unequal power, 'fair play' will always favour the stronger side. Liberals who insist on fairness in the Grunwick struggle inevitably lend support to the employers, for the employers own and control the means of production and the workers own only their ability to work. This gives overwhelming strength to the former. Joe Rogaly's book is a masterpiece of 'fairness', and thus a gross distortion of what is happening at Grunwick.

The faults of this book spring from Rogaly's failure to understand what class is. For him, the working class is distinguished from the capitalist class by different mortality rates, sick pay schemes and type of cigarettes smoked, and not by the fact that the workers have no control over the means by which they produce their livelihood. He sees the class struggle not as the root of the Grunwick dispute, but as something imported by the Unions and thus, after his account of the initial walkout in 1976, he loses sight of the Grunwick workers and relates only the doings of APEX, Brent Trades Council and the TUC.

Rogaly also overlooks the real significance of the fact that the Grunwick workforce is predominantly Asian and female. He realises this is a way of keeping wages down but not that Grunwick workers are doubly exploited. He gives some interesting background material on the East African Asians, but in the end he can only comprehend the Grunwick workers as petty bourgeois housewives working for pin money. The fact that many of their husbands are in work almost justifies for Rogaly the appalling wages Grunwick pay. He overlooks the fact that women and blacks constitute a secondary labour market, working in the worst industries and find to get the boot in a crisis. The important thing is not whether Grunwick workers' wages compare favourably with wages in other film processing firms, but the fact that workers everywhere have no control over their work.

Rogaly's impartiality is, in fact, pretty fragile. There is an enormous difference between his account of the Brent Trades Council and his account of the National Association for Freedom. He makes much of the number of committees on which 'bearded, twenty-eight year-old' Jack Dromey sits and the Trades Council's links with tenants' associations, Brent Women's Centre, the OAP's committee, Harlequin Advice Centre, Brent Community Relations Council, etc. He manages to imply that the whole business is rather sinister.

When he comes to NAFF, however, we are not told of its connections. We are not told, for example, that Robert Moss, its director, worked for the Institute for the Study of Conflict, which follows Nelson's counter-insurgency theories, has contact with the South African security force BOSS, and advocates the sacking of communists. We are not told that Brian Crozier, the director of the Institute, is on the NAFF Council, nor that he set up the CIA-backed *Forum World Features* who commissioned Moss's book *Chilly's Mind and Experiment*, nor that Moss looks forward to the day when a British Financier comes to power.

Instead, Rogaly treats us to a summary of Moss's book *The Collapse of Democracy*. However, he lets the cat out of the bag when he says that

some of NAFF's policies are in tune with what he himself has argued in his *Financial Times* column.

He believes that the laws on industrial relations should be more explicit and that working class people can best pursue their interests through parliamentary and legal channels. He harps on the 'power of the Unions', but does not recognise that the corollary of their power is the help they give the efficient running of capitalism: the most important thing about the mass picket on July 11 was the way the big trade union delegations led people away from Grunwick, allowing the scab bus in. Marshall Colman

THE ULSTER CONFLICT. By Dave Mansell (Interrogations 10/11. £1)

Interrogations is a quarterly International Review of Anarchist Research which began publication at the end of 1974. For two years it was edited by the veteran anarchist Louis Mercier Vega, for a year it has been produced by an anarchist collective in Turin, and so far there have been eleven fat issues containing long articles in four languages—French, Italian, Spanish and English.

The main problem of such a publication is of course that few people can read more than one language, and even with abstracts in the other three languages most of each issue is inaccessible to most people. Those who read only English have had relatively few articles, virtually all from the United States, but the two latest issues (10 and 11) contain a 30,000 word British anarchist press, and for the first time *Interrogations* is directly relevant to readers in this country.

The Ulster Conflict is, however, a disappointing item to find in a paper which is both international and anarchist. Mansell has written a detailed account of Northern Ireland, going back two thousand years, which will be found informative and interesting especially by non-British readers, but which in general says little that can't be found in standard books on the subject, and which in particular says little about factors that are crucial to any libertarian discussion of the Northern Irish question.

Mansell mentions Marxist analysis, and, although he doesn't explicitly either reject or accept it, his approach does seem to be generally Marxist. It is of course important to include such economic factors as class structure, land ownership, modes of production, multinational capitalism, and imperialism exploitation in a discussion of Ulster, as of any other political problem, but, as Tom Nairn emphasises in his Marxist book *The Break-up of Britain* (New Left Books, 1977), a Marxist analysis misses precisely the essential factors which dominate Ulster—religion and nationalism.

Mansell says that the Ulster conflict 'has not been over doctrinal differences', which is true but misleading. Few religious conflicts have been over doctrinal differences, because religion goes beyond doctrine to provide much of the system of belief and behaviour which gives a community its identity. Mansell puts the 'development' of Catholic and Protestant 'identity' in Ulster into quotation marks, as if the process involved the artificial creation of imaginary entities. He doesn't quite say that the two communities suffer from false consciousness, or that the two religions are rival brands of people's opium, but he comes dangerously close to this simplistic diagnosis which is the common left wing non-explanation of hard facts.

The first hard fact is that Northern Ireland contains two similar but

separate communities identified by two similar but separate nations, or peoples, or races. Whatever you call them, the Irish Catholics (the indigenous population long subjugated by the English) and the Ulster Protestants (the Presbyterian Scots imported by the English to help subjugate the Irish) are not just victims of British imperialism who refuse to unite against their real enemies, but are genuine phenomena which must be treated phenomenologically—that is, in terms of their own beliefs and behaviour.

The second hard fact is that there is no solution to the Northern Irish question, apart from violent suppression at one extreme or gradual evolution at the other. The two communities are at the same time so narrowly segregated in history, culture, housing, education, and employment, and so widely mixed geographically and economically that conflict is almost inevitable and cooperation almost



impossible. Mansell mentions some of the few instances of joint activity, but they are exceptions that prove the rule, and any realistic prognosis must take account of the contra-indications suggested by Cyprus, Palestine, or even Southern Africa.

Yet, in a situation which has baffled all liberal and socialist efforts, there is a libertarian approach to Northern Ireland, and perhaps the most disappointing feature of *The Ulster Conflict* is that Mansell says so little about recent significant developments, giving only a few pages to the 'Troubles' of the past decade, and barely mentioning the encouraging signs which suggest that there may be a human answer to the Northern Irish question. Nicolas Walter

MUTINIES: 1917-20. By Dave Lamb. (Solidarity 50p)

This carefully researched pamphlet continues *Solidarity's* consistent attempts to generalise the experience of 'all those who are in conflict with the present authoritarian social structure, both in industry and society at large'. [As We See It]. Libertarians often distrust the idea of militancy in the armed and police forces, ignoring the fact that they are recruited from the working class and that the divisions within them between order-givers and order-takers are class divisions. They sometimes confuse opposition to the organisation with opposition to its rank and file. It is a mistake one would not expect of libertarians. Working for a revolution with no vanguard or central command, and one that does not reproduce the organisation of the bourgeois state, they depend more on the disaffection, sororisation and fraternisation of the armed forces than do the Leninists.

Mutinies describes some of the strikes, walkouts, demonstrations and take-overs by soldiers and sailors at the close of the First World War. Sick of conditions sometimes worse than those of enemy prisoners, eager for demobilisation, fearful of unemployment when they were demobbed and reluctant to fight against the Bolsheviks, they took great risks and overthrew the authority of their officers. (The class nature of these mutinies is highlighted by the number of NCO's who participated.) Some of the mutinies were small and shortlived: 500 RAF men at Biggin Hill went on strike for improvements in their living conditions, and met with complete and almost immediate success. Others were much larger: 20,000 soldiers went on strike at Southampton and took over the docks, but were easily quelled. Others were far-reaching in their consequences: in Calais the troops formed a Soldiers' and Sailors' Association, democratically organised on the basis of delegation. In the actions that Dave Lamb mentions—and his list is not exhaustive—some 80,000 people were involved. Considering the risk of being killed on the spot, the power against which they rose up and the years of military indoctrination some of them had absorbed, the significance of these actions is greater than the numbers might at first suggest.



The military and civil authorities were extremely worried by the mutinies. A secret War Office Circular (leaked by the *Daily Herald*) asked officers for regular reports on the loyalty of their men. 'Will troops in various areas respond to orders for assistance to preserve the public peace? Will they assist in strike-breaking? Will they parade for draft to overseas, especially to Russia?' it said. With small let-up in pre-war industrial militancy and the success of the Bolsheviks facing them, the ruling class realised the reliability of the troops was crucial. Dave Lamb suggests that the Bolshevik military success was largely due to the disaffection of the troops sent to attack them. At Seleskoe and Archangel, counterrevolutionary forces refused to fight.

It is over-optimistic to believe that all mutinies are essentially libertarian. More important than the casting down of old structures is the character of the new organisation thrown up. Although many soldiers and sailors formed councils, other risings were diffuse expressions of anger—for example, the riot of ex-servicemen in Luton in which the town hall was burnt down. But *Mutinies* demonstrates that the 'impossible' can happen. As Dave Lamb puts it, 'the armed forces can themselves become a source of revolutionary activity giving expression to libertarian demands.' Marshall Coleman

Inside: the events that led to the murder of Ensslin, Baader and Raspe, and a model look at West Germany.